

REMARKS

Claims 1-21 were pending in the application, with claims 1-6 and 12-21 rejected and claims 7-11 objected to. Claims 1, 6-8, and 10 are amended herein, claims 2 and 14-21 are canceled, and new claims 22-26 are added. Accordingly, claims 1, 3-13, and 22-26 are active in the application. Reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112

Claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter that was not enabled—a “visual scrolling cue.” Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

A “visual scrolling cue” should be interpreted using the ordinary meaning of that term, as applicant has defined no other meaning. One skilled in the art also can largely understand it by means of what it is not, as described at page 3, line 22: a step “jump” in the program guide contents with no visual cue as to how the new information came to replace the old information. The written description gives numerous examples of visual scrolling cues: fluid motion scrolling, wheel rotation animation, file tab animation, etc. Applicant respectfully submits that those skilled in the art understand how to manipulate graphical displays to achieve such visual cues.

Claim 8 was objected to due to a typographical error detected by the Examiner. Claim 8 has been corrected to agree with the description in the specification, as assumed by the Examiner.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §§ 102 and 103

Claims 1, 3, 5-6, 14-16, and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,850,218 (LaJoie). Claims 2, 4, and 17-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over LaJoie. Claims 12 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over LaJoie in view of Okhura. Claim 21 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over LaJoie in view of Noguchi.

Claim 2 has been incorporated into claim 1, and claims 14-21 have been canceled. In view of the amendments to the claims and the following remarks, the rejection of claims 1, 3-6, and 12-13 is respectfully traversed.

Applicant has amended claim 1 to include a limitation similar to that found in now-canceled claim 2: "bounding a program selection area from vertical movement, while allowing the program selection area to move horizontally." As noted by the Examiner, the prior art teaches fixed program selection areas and roving selection areas, but not a program selection area fixed in one dimension but not the other. The prior art fails to suggest the claimed method including such a limitation or provide a motivation for modifying LaJoie as suggested by the Examiner. The motivation suggested by the Examiner appears to be his own. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 as amended is neither taught nor suggested by the prior art—that it solves visualization/navigation problems inherent in both a fully-fixed and a fully-roving cursor implementation, and yet is not contemplated by the prior art, is suggestive of non-obviousness.

Applicant submits that claims 3-6 and 12-13 are patentable based on their dependence from claim 1. Further, claim 6 (which claim 12 depends from) is amended to recite that program details for the program appearing in the selection region are displayed within the selection region itself, as shown for example in Figures 5-8. The prior art fails to teach or suggest the claimed method including displaying program details in the selection region.

In summary, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 1, 3-6, and 12-13 be withdrawn.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 7-11 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 7 now appears as an independent claim including all the limitations of original base claim 1 and intervening claim 6.

Claim 10 now appears as an independent claim including all the limitations of original base claim 1 and intervening claim 6.

Claims 8-9 and 11 depend respectively from claims 7 and 10.

New Claims

Claims 22-24 claim additional and related subject matter from the original application, as supported, e.g., by Figure 10 and the accompanying description. According to claim 22, and unlike claim 1, the program titles correspond to a channel identifier in a channel selection region (e.g., 166 in Figure 10), and the program titles change as the user

scrolls different channel identifiers within selection region 166. Claims 23 and 24 claim additional features of this embodiment. As the prior art does not appear to teach or suggest the method as set forth in claims 22-24, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of these claims as well.

Claim 25 also claims additional and related subject matter from the original application, as supported, e.g., by Figure 7 and the first paragraph of page 6. Rather than fixing the program selection area in the vertical dimension and allowing the viewer to move it in the horizontal dimension as in amended Claim 1, the program selection area in Claim 25 is fixed in both dimensions, and is located near the center of the display. It differs from LaJoie in that LaJoie specifically teaches a fixed program selection area at the leftmost edge of the display (column 25, lines 7-14). The present invention's advantage is that the viewer sees what programs are scheduled before, as well as after, the selected time, thus avoiding disorientation from a selection area that abuts one edge of the program area. As the prior art does not appear to teach or suggest the method as set forth in claims 25, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of this claim as well.

Claim 26 recites the elements of original claim 1, along with the additional limitation that program details for the program appearing in the selection region are displayed within the selection region itself, as shown for example in Figures 5-8. The prior art fails to teach or suggest the claimed method including displaying program details in the selection region.

For the foregoing reasons, reconsideration and allowance of the application as amended is solicited. The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (503) 222-3613 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.



20575

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

Respectfully submitted,

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.

James E. Harris
Reg. No. 40,013

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM
1030 SW Morrison Street
Portland, OR 97205
(503) 222-3613

RESPONSE TO
OFFICE ACTION

PAGE 11 OF 11

DOCKET No. 8371-35
SERIAL No. 09/503,649